

Record Request DTE 1-4

Request:

For the years 1995 through 2001, what is the number of times in the aggregate that the company used an outside call center? For example, indicate the number of days, not the number of calls that went to the outside call center. Also provide the calls that were routed to an outside call center as a percentage of total calls for each year. If the information is not available, please indicate as such. Also provide the name of the firm that we are contracting with for the emergency calls.

Response:

The Company uses 21st Century, of Columbus, OH for *overflow* automated outage calls. The available data regarding the number of times in the aggregate that the company used this vendor is for the years 1999 - 2001. The number of calls that were routed to this outside vendor varies each year depending on the number of customer outages, time of day, and severity of the outages experienced during the year.

YEAR	21 st Century Calls	21 st Century Calls as a % of Total Calls	Days 21 st Used
1999	21,412	0.9%	190
2000	15,610	0.6%	193
2001	(1) 45,774	1.4%	236

(1) June 2001 experienced severe summer storms accounting for 13,796 calls

Response prepared by or under the supervision of: M. Sorgman

Record Request DTE 1-5

Request:

Please explain in great detail, why the Companies excluded Eastern Edison Companies' figures from Data Request DTE 1-5, Attachment 1, Page 3 of 3. If it is possible to include those figures, please provide a schedule including them.

Response:

The Companies provided the calculation attached to Data Request DTE 1-5 as an illustration of how the calculation would work. Eastern Edison Company's kWh data was excluded from the calculation because Eastern Edison's customers were not billed on Mass. Electric rates for all of the months during the year 2000. May 2000 was the first month in which there is kWh data for Eastern Edison customers served under Mass. Electric's rate classes, as the consolidation of the two companies was effective on May 1, 2000. For the first four months of 2000, Eastern Edison customers were served under Eastern Edison rates. Several Eastern Edison rates mapped to more than one Mass. Electric rate class. Therefore, the Companies could not simply take the kWh data in Eastern Edison rate class format and map these to Mass. Electric rates. Rather than exclude only four months of kWh data from the calculation or attempt to estimate a mapping of Eastern Edison kWh data to Mass. Electric data, the Companies chose to exclude all of Eastern Edison kWh data from the calculation. While the Companies do not believe the exclusion of this data significantly alters the average and annual usage reflected in the calculation, in future years the Companies would recalculate these values using available data from the most recent full calendar year.

Prepared by or under the supervision of: R.H. McLaren

Record Request DTE 1-6

Request:

Please supply the back-up information explaining exactly how the percentage satisfaction numbers contained in response to AG-1-1 were determined with reference to the customer satisfaction surveys that are contained in AG-1-12.

Response:

For Massachusetts Electric, each year a random sample of customers were asked the following question: "On a scale of 1 to 7, where 1 means "poor" and 7 means "excellent," overall, how would you rate Massachusetts Electric's service to you?"

For Eastern Edison, each year a random sample of customers were asked the following question: "I would like to know how you rate your electric company overall on a scale of "1" to "7", where "1" means "very unfavorable" and "7" means "very favorable." The more favorable you generally feel toward your electric company, the higher the number you would give."

In both cases, the benchmark is based on the percent of customers that gave a rating of 5, 6, or 7 to these questions.

See attachment 1 for the annual results for Massachusetts Electric and Eastern Edison contained in AG-1-1.

Prepared by or under the supervision of: M. Sorgman

Record Request DTE 1-7

Request:

Why was the customer satisfaction survey for 1996 not included in the attachment to AG-1-12?

Response:

The questions used in the 1996 survey are the same as in the 1995 survey. However, we are unable to locate a copy the 1996 survey instrument.

Prepared by or under the supervision of: M. Sorgman

Record Request DTE 1-8

Request:

Please explain the two different figures for line losses for 1998. DTE Data Request 1-3, Attachment 1, Page 5 of 65 shows line losses at 3.88 and Exhibit MEC-1, Book 2, Attachment 17 has line losses at 3.98.

Response:

Exhibit MEC-1, Book 2, Attachment 17 is the Original SQ Plan from the Rate Plan Settlement as filed in 1999. The calculated results at that time were subsequently updated. The correct number for 1998 is 3.88, and the current respective schedules reflect the most recent information for that period.

Prepared by or under the supervision of: J. Bouford

Record Request DTE 1-9

Request:

Please explain how the Company calculated the average of 76.9 percent customer contact satisfaction contained in MEC-2, Attachment 10, Page 7 of 12. In addition, please explain any discrepancy with the figures contained in the response as compared to the Department's discovery.

Response:

For the customer contact survey, customers who contacted the call center within the prior month regarding eight types of requests are included in the survey group. The eight types of requests included power outage, meter on, meter off, meter test, meter reread, meter exchange, payment plan, and collections. The results represent the percent of customers who gave a response of 6 or 7 to the following question: "Thinking about when you telephoned Mass. Electric, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the contact you had with Mass. Electric? We'll use a scale of 1 to 7, where 1 means 'extremely dissatisfied' and 7 means 'extremely satisfied'". The overall results are weighed based on the number of these transactions typically performed at the call center during a year.

On MEC-2, Attachment 10, Page 7 of 12, the mean of 76.9 percent was based on the average of the preliminary results of 74.8 percent for 1997 and 78.9 percent for 1998. As stated above, the overall results are weighed based on the number of the eight types of transactions typically performed at the call center during the year. Subsequent to the submission of this preliminary data, more complete data regarding the number of transactions performed at the call center during this period of time was received from the survey firm, which adjusted the overall percentages to 74.1 percent for 1997 and 79.2 percent for 1998.

Prepared by or under the supervision of: M. Sorgman

Record Request DTE 1-11

Request:

To the extent possible, please provide the figures of the weights assigned to each rate class of the other Massachusetts utilities.

In the event that the information is available, please recalculate the figures in Data Request DTE 1-5, Page 5, bottom right-hand corner, using the additional weights.

Response:

The calculation of average distribution rates of Mass. Electric and the other electric distribution companies in Massachusetts to determine whether Mass. Electric has met the standard proposed in its December 14, 2001 service quality filing is based solely on average and annual usage data of Mass. Electric. This calculation mirrors that approved by the Department in Docket No. 99-47, the Companies' November 29, 1999 Rate Plan Settlement, Book 2 of 2, Attachment 8, except on a much smaller scale (Massachusetts utilities rather than similarly unbundled utilities in New England, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey). The analysis is intended to reflect what Mass. Electric's average customer in each of its four major rate classes would be charged, on average, based on the distribution rates of the other electric distribution companies in Massachusetts. By using the rate classes included in the calculation, Mass. Electric is reflecting almost all of its entire kWh deliveries in the analysis. It then determines, from the possible tariffed rates of the other Massachusetts electric distribution companies, the rate class on which the Mass. Electric customer would be served, based upon the average monthly usage of the Mass. Electric customer. The intended result is to derive what an average Mass. Electric customer would pay another electric distribution company under their appropriate tariffs.

Additionally, in responding to the Department's request, attempting to derive the customer mix for the other utilities that would correspond to the four major rate classes of Mass. Electric would not necessarily result in similar proportions presented in the response to Data Request DTE 1-5. Using the kWh data of the corresponding rate classes on which the average Mass. Electric customers would be served by the other utilities, there is no guarantee that the customer mix calculation would encompass a significant amount of the kWh deliveries of the other utilities, as is the case for Mass. Electric. Customer size, service characteristics, and tariff availability provisions for Mass. Electric may not be comparable to those of the other utilities. Where Mass. Electric has one rate class to serve a certain size or group of customers, other utilities may have two or more. Also, there may be some overlap of rate classes in which one rate class of another utility

Record Request DTE 1-11 (continued)

may serve both an average small general service customer served under Mass. Electric Rate G-1 and a medium general service customer served under Mass. Electric Rate G-2.

In this example, to respond to the Department's request, Mass. Electric would need to segregate the other utility's rate class that corresponds to two of Mass. Electric's rate classes in order to provide a proper matching between Mass. Electric's customer profile and that of the other utility. Mass. Electric does not have the information that would be required to perform such an analysis.

Prepared by or under the supervision of: R.H. McLaren